



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/707,677 11/07/00 LOPEZ

A

MM91/0718
PATH GROUP, INC.
1019 NORTH COLORADO STREET SUITE 103
GILBERT, AR 85233-2240

EXAMINER

PRASAD, C

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2839

DATE MAILED:

07/18/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/707,677

Applicant(s)

LOPEZ, ALBERTO A.

Examiner

Chandrika Prasad

Art Unit

2839

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 November 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-31 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

- 15) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 16) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 17) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 2.
- 18) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 19) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 20) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The independent claim 1 recites " a plurality of types" which is not clear.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1-5, 8, 10 -13 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Bell.

Bell (Figures 1-6) shows a power transmission system having a power distribution block 114 in a housing (shell) 14 with a plurality of parallel conduction paths 120 with opposite ends to which a plurality of connectors of different types can be electrically and mechanically connected and removed. The system includes a plurality of communing clips 60, which allows interconnecting adjacent paths.

5. Claims 30-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Tarver.

Tarver (Figures 1-6) shows an electrical connector having a first portion 23 of conductive material with a circular hole to receive a multi-strand coaxial cable bundle 22 and

Art Unit: 2839

a second portion 21 made of metal or plastic (column2, lines 70-75) with a rectangular hole receiving an insulated cable 20 wherein the two holes are coaxial.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 6 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bell in view of Hughes.

Bell shows all the features of these claims as described in Paragraph 4 above except the connectors on one side having a single interface. Connectors having a single or multiple interfaces are well known in the art of electrical connectors. Hughes (Figures 1-10) shows a connector system with connectors at one end having an interconnected multiple interfaces while the other end has a single interface. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the instant invention to use a single or multiple interface connectors because these are considered equivalents in the art of electrical connectors and selection of any of these known equivalents would be within the level of ordinary skill in the art.

8. Claims 7 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bell.

Bell shows all the features of these claims as described in Paragraph 4 above except the connector interfaces being circular or non-circular cross-section. The instant invention

Art Unit: 2839

does not provide any reasons or problems to be solved by having a circular or non-circular cross-section. Official Notice is taken that circular and non-circular interfaces are well known in the art of electrical connectors. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the instant invention to use a circular or non-circular interface because these are considered equivalents in the art of electrical connectors and selection of any of these known equivalents would be within the level of ordinary skill in the art.

9. Claims 9 and 17-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bell.

Bell shows all the features of these claims as described in Paragraph 4 above except the use of fuses. The use of fuses is common knowledge and fuses arranged in rows and columns are routinely used in most circuit breakers in households as well as in automobiles. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the instant invention to use fuses between the conduction paths because this would protect the electrical devices connected to the power distribution system.

Contact Information

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chandrika Prasad at (703) 308-0977. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Brian Sircus, can be reached at (703) 308-3119. The fax number for this Group is (703) 308/7722. Any inquiry of a general nature should be directed to the Group receptionist at (703) 308-1782.



Chandrika Prasad

July 7, 2001

TULSIDAS PATEL
PRIMARY EXAMINER